

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | F       | ILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------|---------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/936,688       |         | 12/28/2001 | Thierry Brusseaux    | 09669.008001 9251   |                  |
| 22511            | 7590    | 12/14/2005 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| OSHA LIA         | NG L.L. | P.         | RUHL, DENNIS WILLIAM |                     |                  |
| 1221 MCKI        | NNEY ST | REET       |                      |                     |                  |
| SUITE 2800       |         |            |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| HOUSTON TX 77010 |         |            |                      | 3620                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)                |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 0.00  | 09/936,688  | BRUSSEAUX, THIERRY          |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit                    |  |  |  |  |
|   | Dennis Ruhl   | 3629                        |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 (   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 October 2005</u> .  |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi   | is action is non-final.   |                             |  |  |  |  |
|   | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some color None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date   |   | atent Application (PTO-152) |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/936,688

Art Unit: 3629

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/3/05 has been entered.

The examiner will address applicant's remarks at the end of this office action.

Currently claims 1,2,4-17 are pending.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1,2,4-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouimet (WO 97/37328) in view of Zeitman (WO 98/04080).

For claims 1,2,4,5,9,10,12,14,15,17, Ouimet discloses a method of managing the parking of vehicles. Ouimet discloses that the user of a parking space enters information concerning the parking of their vehicle (i.e. vehicle location information and parking time information) into a ticket machine 12. That information is sent to a central computer system (server) 16 and to mobile units 18 (control elements) that are carried by monitoring agents (parking wardens). The fee for parking is determined based on

Application/Control Number: 09/936,688

Art Unit: 3629

the location and time information. A debit card or credit card can be used to pay the parking fee.

Not disclosed is that the user can send parking information to the server by mobile telephone and that the server would then send the parking information to the ticket machine.

Also not disclosed is that the ticket machine supplies parking authorization control elements with at least information concerning the parking time upon request by a human monitoring agent.

With respect to the use of a mobile telephone and the conveyance of the user's parking data from the server to the ticket machine, Zeitman discloses a parking management system that has a high level of user convenience. Zeitman discloses that the user can directly communicate with a central computer system (server system) by using their mobile telephone and can provide the information such as vehicle space and time information by using their telephone. This would allow for more user convenience with respect to adding another way for the user to conduct the parking space use transaction as opposed to having to use the ticket machine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Ouimet with the additional ability to take user information by telephone as is disclosed by Zeitman. The user would then have the ability to communicate with the server 16 directly by telephone and then the server would update the payment terminals and mobile units with new information.

Page 4

Concerning the limitation of the ticket machine supplying information upon request by a human monitoring agent, the examiner takes "official notice" that it is old and well known in computer network environments that data can be either sent periodically to others in the network or can be made available upon request by a user of the system. An example of this is the "refresh" button for a windows browser. A person can log onto a web page to view some given data, and the page can either refresh itself periodically so that the user can view any updated data, or the user can themselves request updated data by using the refresh button. The updating of data upon request of a human being that desires to view that data is well known and old in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the parking monitoring agents with the ability to request information from the ticket machine concerning parking data so that the monitoring agent can ensure that the most updated data is in fact received by the mobile units. Even though in Ouimet the transmission of parking data (from the server or the ticket machine) will take place anytime new data is entered into the system, providing the feature of providing information upon request of the monitoring agent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art so that the monitoring agent can ensure for themselves that they are viewing the most recent data.

With respect to claims 6,7,8, the location of the parking space can be a number, which satisfies what is claimed. It does not matter if the number is a space number, a vehicle number, etc.. A number is a number and the prior art discloses the taking of a number.

For claim 11, the authorization control element supplied by the ticket machine is a list of information as claimed.

For claim 13, the "electronic certificate" is considered to be any data sent from the server to the phone during the parking use transaction. This could be a receipt in electronic form or any other data sent to the phone. The term "electronic certificate" is very broad language and can be almost anything.

With respect to claim 16, the account of the user (debit card account) is fully capable of being recharged by a prepaid scratchable card. A user can purchase a lottery ticket (with scratchable areas to show what you won if anything) and if they win any amount of money, that money could be deposited into the debit card account. The prior art is fully capable of what is claimed.

## **Response to Arguments**

Applicant has argued that the claims are novel because of the recitation that the human monitoring agent can request data from the ticket machine. In the resulting system of the 103 rejection (Ouimet modified with Zeitman), anytime new data is entered into the system (via the server or ticket machine), that data is sent to the mobile units and the server or ticket machine. Providing the monitoring agent with the ability to specifically request data from the ticket machine has been addressed by the examiner in the rejection of record and no further comments are deemed necessary. This is the

Application/Control Number: 09/936,688 Page 6

Art Unit: 3629

only limitation argued for patentability so the rejection of all dependent claims and the use of Zeitman by the examiner in the 103 rejection is deemed proper.

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Liebesny et al. (5131020) discloses a computer network system where data can be updated periodically or can be updated upon request by a human user of the system.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Ruhl whose telephone number is 703-308-2262 or 571-272-6808 (effective 4/13/05). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703-308-2702 or 571-272-6812 (effective 4/13/05). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DENNIS RUHL PRIMARY EXAMINER